

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q80489

Yoshinori YOSHIDA, et al.

Appln. No.: 10/802,883

Group Art Unit: 1711

Confirmation No.: 5194

Examiner: Thao T. TRAN

Filed: March 18, 2004

For: CLEANING SHEET AND ITS PRODUCTION METHOD AS WELL AS
TRANSPORTING MEMBER HAVING SUCH CLEANING SHEET

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Please review and enter the following remarks summarizing the interview conducted on April 26, 2007.

REMARKS

An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) was attached with the Office Communication dated May 2, 2007.

During the interview, the following was discussed:

1. Brief description of exhibits or demonstration: None
2. Identification of claims discussed: claims 1-21.
3. Identification of art discussed: Skinner '793 and Grube '052.
4. Identification of principal proposed amendments: In particular, the Examiner suggested that the claims should use affirmative and not negative language with respect to the use of additives and suggested that the claims should be more specific with respect to the ranges of additives that are used, such that the prior art is distinguished. The Examiner also suggested that

the softness of the material in the cleaning layer should be expressed with respect to the parameters and the composition used. The Examiner stated that the claims should specifically mention the use of an acrylic polymer in the composition, which the Examiner considered to be “very important.” With regard to the thickness of the cleaning layer, the Examiner noted that a specific range also may be needed. Further, the Examiner asked Applicants to point out evidence demonstrating “unexpected results.”

5. Brief Identification of principal arguments: Applicants stated that one skilled in the art would find in the original disclosure adequate support for the limitations with respect to the additives used. Applicants agreed to amend the claims to add range limitations with respect to thickness and elasticity, and to add a specific recitation of acrylic polymer in the cleaning layer.

6. Indication of other pertinent matters discussed: An apparent inconsistency in the description at page 29, lines 1-5 of Examples 1-5 in the Tables 1 and 2 at page 28. There it is stated that “no foreign matters remained in the cleaning sheets.” In fact, there is no foreign matter on the tips and it does remain in the cleaning sheets.

7. Results of Interview: No agreement was reached as to patentability of specific claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
U. S. Application No.: 10/802,883

Attorney

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan J. Kasper/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 29, 2007